	Case 5:06-cv-04442-JF Document 4 Filed 10/24/06 Page 1 of 4  **Original filed 10/24/06**
4	
1	
2	
3	
4 5	
6	
7	
8	
9	NOT FOR CITATION
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	
13	RICKEY LOUIS ALFORD, a.k.a. ) No. C 06-4442 JF (PR) Morris Day,
14	) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE Plaintiff, ) RE: DISMISSAL PURSUANT ) TO 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g)
15	vs. )
16	DR. WINN, et al.,
17	Defendants. ) (Docket No. 3)
18	
19	Plaintiff is a state prisoner and frequent litigant in this court. He filed a <u>pro se</u> civil
20	rights action against several psychologists and psychiatrists concerning his mental
21	competency trial in Monterey Superior Court. Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed
22	in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.
23	DISCUSSION  The Driver Litigation Deform Act of 1005 ("DIDA"), which was exceed an April
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PLRA"), which was enacted on April
25	26, 1996, provides that a prisoner may not bring a civil action or appeal a civil judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 "if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while
20 27	incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the
28	United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to Order to Show Cause Re: Dismissal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) P:pro-se\sj.jf\cr.06\Alford442oscifp 1
	II.

state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Because § 1915(g) is a procedural rule that does not raise retroactivity concerns, cases which were dismissed before the effective date of § 1915(g), i.e., April 26, 1996, may be counted as qualifying dismissals or "strikes." See Tierney v. Kupers, 128 F.3d 1310, 1311-12 (9th Cir. 1997).

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

For purposes of a dismissal that may be counted under § 1915(g), the phrase "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted" parallels the language of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and apparently means the same thing. Andrews v. King, 398 F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th Cir. 2005). A case "is frivolous if it is 'of little weight or importance: having no basis in law or fact." <u>Id.</u> (citation omitted). "A case is malicious if it was filed with the 'intention or desire to harm another." Id. (citation omitted). "Not all unsuccessful cases qualify as a strike under § 1915(g). Rather, § 1915(g) should be used to deny a prisoner's IFP status only when, after careful evaluation of the order dismissing an action, and other relevant information, the district court determines that the action was dismissed because it was frivolous, malicious or failed to state a claim." Id. The prisoner must be given notice of the potential disqualification under § 1915(g) -- by either the district court or the defendants – but the prisoner bears the ultimate burden of persuasion that § 1915(g) does not bar pauper status for him. Id. Andrews thus implicitly allows the court to <u>sua sponte</u> raise the § 1915(g) problem, but requires the court to notify the plaintiff of the earlier dismissals it considers to support a § 1915(g) dismissal and allow the plaintiff an opportunity to be heard on the matter before dismissing the action. See id. at 1120.

A review of the dismissal orders in Plaintiff's prior prisoner actions in this Court reveal that he has had at least three such cases dismissed on the grounds that they were frivolous, malicious, or failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. See Day v. Feinstein, C 96-1796-FMS (dismissed as frivolous); Alford v. Johnson, C 05-1352 JF (PR) (dismissed for failure to state a claim); Alford v. Sony Electronic Inc., C 05-1581 JF (PR) (dismissed for failure to state a claim). In light of these dismissals, and because

## Case 5:06-cv-04442-JF Document 4 Filed 10/24/06 Page 3 of 4

1	Plaintiff is not under imminent danger of serious physical injury, he is ordered TO
2	SHOW CAUSE within <b>thirty days</b> of the date this order is filed, why this action should
3	not be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.
5	DATED:10/20/06
6	JEREMY FOGEL United States District Judge
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	The Court notes that such a dismissal would be without prejudice to bringing it in a paid
28	complaint. See Adepegba v. Hammons, 103 F.3d 383, 388 (5th Cir. 1996).
	Order to Show Cause Re: Dismissal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) P:pro-se\sj.jf\cr.06\Alford442oscifp 3

## Case 5:06-cv-04442-JF Document 4 Filed 10/24/06 Page 4 of 4 A copy of this ruling was mailed to the following: Rickey Louis Alford J-39242 CSP - Salinas Valley IV P.O. Box 1060 Soledad, CA 93960-1060 Order to Show Cause Re: Dismissal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) $P:pro-se\sj.jf\cr.06\Alford442 oscifp$